

Remarks

Status of the Application

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 13, 14, 17, 29 and 31-33 were pending. The Office Action mailed January 3, 2012 (the "Office Action") rejected claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 13-14, 17, 29 and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication No. 2006/0182055 to Coffee et al. ("Coffee"), in view of US Patent No. 7,119,831 to Ohto et al. ("Ohto"), in further view of US Patent No. 6,900,762 to Andrews et al. ("Andrews") and in further view of US Patent No. 7,146,192 to Cooper et al. ("Cooper").

This paper amends claims 1, 7, 8, 11, and 29. No claims have been added; claim 32 is canceled. Hence, after entry of this paper, claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 13, 14, 17, 29, 31 and 33 will stand pending for examination. Claims 1, 11 and 29 are independent claims.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a portable technician device comprising "a display" and "an imaging device configured to capture a plurality of images." Claim 1 has been further amended to specify that the portable technician device is configured to "receive, from the imaging device, a captured image of the particular cabinet," "receive, from the network engineering center over the service network, the set of equipment characteristics associated with the telecommunications plant equipment in the particular cabinet," and "display, on the display, the captured image of the particular cabinet simultaneous with at least a portion of the set of equipment characteristics associated with the telecommunications plant equipment in the particular cabinet, the displayed portion of the set of equipment characteristics comprising detailed cabinet configuration information and information including card configuration within the cabinet." Support for these amendments can be found throughout the application, including in particular Fig. 3 (and corresponding portions of the written description), along with paragraphs 0049-54 of the specification as filed.

Claim 1 has been further amended for internal consistency and clarity. Claims 7 and 8 have been amended for consistency with claim 1.

Claims 11 and 29 have been amended to recite features similar to some of those described above.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 13, 14, 17, 29, 31, 32 and 33

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 13, 14, 17, 29, 31, 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coffee, in view of Ohto, in further view of Andrews and in further view of Cooper. Independent claims 1, 11, and 29 have been amended as noted above, and it is respectfully submitted that no combination of these references discloses each element of any of the independent claims. (Claim 32 has been canceled, so the rejection of that claim is moot.)

For example, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a portable technician device configured to “receive, from the imaging device, a captured image of the particular cabinet,” “receive, from the network engineering center over the service network, the set of equipment characteristics associated with the telecommunications plant equipment in the particular cabinet,” and “display, on the display, the captured image of the particular cabinet simultaneous with at least a portion of the set of equipment characteristics associated with the telecommunications plant equipment in the particular cabinet, the displayed portion of the set of equipment characteristics comprising detailed cabinet configuration information including configuration of the telecommunications cabinet equipment.” A review of Coffee, Ohto, Andrews, and Cooper does not reveal any disclosure of such functionality.

Although Ohto does disclose a sort of augmented reality system, Ohto does not disclose any facility for receiving and displaying cabinet configuration information. Nor do any of the other cited references. Coffee, on which the Office relies as disclosing the transmission of different types of asset information, still does not even suggest the functionality recited by claim 1 with regard to the display of a cabinet along with detailed information about that cabinet and the telecommunications plant equipment therein.

Andrews, which discloses the use of RFID for location determination, and Cooper, which discloses a wireless base station with a GPS, do not appear to be relevant to the features discussed above.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over any combination of Coffee, Ohto, Andrews, and Cooper. Claims 11 and 29, which recite features similar to those discussed in the context of claim 1, are believed to be allowable for at least similar reasons.

Dependent claims 2-5, 7-9, 13, 14, 17, 31, and 33 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable base claims.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If it would be helpful to obtain favorable consideration of this case, the Examiner is encouraged to call and discuss this case with the undersigned.

This paper constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and an authorization to charge all fees therefore to deposit account No. 19-5117, if not otherwise specifically requested. The undersigned hereby authorizes the charge of any fees created by the filing of this document or any deficiency of fees submitted herewith to be charged to deposit account No. 19-5117.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2012-04-03

/Chad E. King/
Chad E. King, #44,187
Swanson & Bratschun, L.L.C.
8210 Southpark Terrace
Littleton, CO 80120
Telephone: (303) 268-0066
Facsimile: (303) 268-0065